

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:
JOHN B. CONKLIN
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
180 N STETSON AV
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
RECEIVED

APR 09 2007

LAB

PAY/TM Due Date

6-3-07

PCT

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL OF
THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT AND
THE WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL
SEARCHING AUTHORITY, OR THE DECLARATION

(PCT Rule 44.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	03 APR 2007
FOR FURTHER ACTION	See paragraphs 1 and 4 below
International filing date (day/month/year)	11 August 2004 (11.08.2004)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 229810	Ord. 19
International application No. PCT/US04/25931	
Applicant MICROSOFT CORPORATION	

1. ☒ The applicant is hereby notified that the international search report and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority have been established and are transmitted herewith.

Filing of amendments and statement under Article 19:

The applicant is notified, if he so wishes, to amend the claims of the international application (see Rule 46):

When? The time limit for filing such amendments is normally two months from the date of transmittal of the international search report.

Where? Directly to the International Bureau of WIPO, 34 chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland, Facsimile No.: (41-22) 338.82.70.

For more detailed instructions, see the notes on the accompanying sheet.

2. ☐ The applicant is hereby notified that no international search report will be established and that the declaration under Article 17(2)(a) to that effect and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority are transmitted herewith.

3. ☒ With regard to the protest against payment of (an) additional fee(s) under Rule 40.2, the applicant is notified that:

☒ the protest together with the decision thereon has been transmitted to the International Bureau together with the applicant's request to forward the texts of both the protest and the decision thereon to the designated Offices.

☐ no decision has been made yet on the protest; the applicant will be notified as soon as a decision is made.

4. **Reminders**

Shortly after the expiration of 18 months from the priority date, the international application will be published by the International Bureau. If the applicant wishes to avoid or postpone publication, a notice of withdrawal of the international application, or of the priority claim, must reach the International Bureau as provided in Rules 90bis.1 and 90bis.3, respectively, before the completion of the technical preparations for international publication.

The applicant may submit comments on an informal basis on the written opinion of the International Searching Authority to the International Bureau. The International Bureau will send a copy of such comments to all designated Offices unless an international preliminary examination report has been or is to be established. These comments would also be made available to the public but not before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date.

Within 19 months from the priority date, but only in respect of some designated Offices, a demand for international preliminary examination must be filed if the applicant wishes to postpone the entry into the national phase until 30 months from the priority date (in some Offices even later); otherwise, the applicant must, within 20 months from the priority date, perform the prescribed acts for entry into the national phase before those designated Offices.

In respect of other designated Offices, the time limit of 30 months (or later) will apply even if no demand is filed within 19 months.

See the Annex to Form PCT/IB/301 and, for details about the applicable time limits, Office by Office, see the *PCT Applicant's Guide*, Volume II, National Chapters and the WIPO Internet site.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/US
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201

Authorized officer

John Cottingham

Telephone No. (571) 272-7079

DEBORAH A. THOMAS
PARALEGAL SPECIALIST

DET

Form PCT/ISA/220 (January 2004)

(See notes on accompanying sheet)

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

(PCT Article 18 and Rules 43 and 44)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 229810	FOR FURTHER ACTION <small>see Form PCT/ISA/220 as well as, where applicable, item 5 below</small>	
International application No. PCT/US04/25931	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 11 August 2004 (11.08.2004)	(Earliest) Priority Date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 30 April 2004 (30.04.2004)
Applicant MICROSOFT CORPORATION		

This international search report has been prepared by this International Searching Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 18. A copy is being transmitted to the International Bureau.

This international search report consists of a total of 3 sheets.



It is also accompanied by a copy of each prior art document cited in this report.

1. **Basis of the Report**

- a. With regard to the language, the international search was carried out on the basis of:



the international application in the language in which it was filed.



a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.2(a) and 23.1(b))

- b. ☐ With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, see Box No. I.

2. ☐ **Certain claims were found unsearchable** (See Box No. II)

3. ☐ **Unity of invention is lacking** (See Box No. III)

4. With regard to the title,



the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.



the text has been established by this Authority to read as follows:

HVT

LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
RECEIVED

APR 09 2007

PAY/TM Due Date _____

5. With regard to the abstract,



the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.



the text has been established, according to Rule 38.2(b), by this Authority as it appears in Box No. IV. The applicant may, within one month from the date of mailing of this international search report, submit comments to this Authority.

6. With regard to the drawings,

- a. the figure of the drawings to be published with the abstract is Figure No. 1



as suggested by the applicant.



as selected by this Authority, because the applicant failed to suggest a figure.



as selected by this Authority, because this figure better characterizes the invention.

- b. ☐ none of the figures is to be published with the abstract.

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.

PCT/US04/25931

Box IV TEXT OF THE ABSTRACT (Continuation of Item 5 of the first sheet)

NEW ABSTRACT

A property tree user interface permits user assignment of values to metadata properties and user navigation of data, within a system that includes a data storage subsystem in which data items are organized and queried by way of properties. The property tree (203) includes nodes that expose properties of data items. A user may interact with the property tree in order to effect an assignment of a property, in which case the value associated with the property in the data storage subsystem is modified. User input with respect to the property tree may also be indicative of a query of data storage, in which case a browsable view (205) of data items responsive to the query is displayed. The property tree may also display nodes that represent folders within a hierarchical file system, nodes that represent properties with inherent hierarchy, and nodes that represent user-defined hierarchical properties.

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.

PCT/US04/25931

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER

IPC: **G06F 17/30** (2006.01)

USPC: 707/2, 3, 4, 100, 104.1, 100, 104.1

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)

U.S.: 707/2, 3, 4, 100, 104.1, 100, 104.1

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practicable, search terms used)
WEST

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
A	US 5,923,328 A (GRIESMER) 13 July 1999 (13.07.1999), col. 5, lines 1-5, col. 6, lines 38-44, col. 9, line 9, col. 10, line 1.	1-40
A	US 5,935,210 A (STARK) 10 August 1999 (10.08.1999), col. 1, lines 28-40, col. 5, lines 9-47.	1-40



Further documents are listed in the continuation of Box C.



See patent family annex.

* Special categories of cited documents	"I" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention
"A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance	"X" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone
"E" earlier application or patent published on or after the international filing date	"Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combinations being obvious to a person skilled in the art
"L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)	"&" document member of the same patent family
"O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means	
"P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed	

Date of the actual completion of the international search

17 February 2007 (17.02.2007)

Name and mailing address of the ISA/US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201

Date of mailing of the international search report

03 APR 2007

Authorized officer

John Cottingham

DEBORAH A. THOMAS
PARALEGAL SPECIALIST

Telephone No. (571) 272-7079

Det

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To: JOHN B. CONKLIN LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD. TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900 180 N STETSON AV CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780
--

Date of mailing <i>(day/month/year)</i>	03 APR 2007
FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	

Applicant's or agent's file reference 229810		
International application No. PCT/US04/25931	International filing date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 11 August 2004 (11.08.2004)	Priority date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 30 April 2004 (30.04.2004)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC: G06F 17/30 (2006.01) USPC: 707/2,3,4,100,104.1,100,104.1		
Applicant MICROSOFT CORPORATION <div style="text-align: right; float: right;"> LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER RECEIVED </div>		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability, citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

LAH

APR 09 2007

PAY/TM Due Date 7-3-07

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201	Date of completion of this opinion 15 March 2007 (15.03.2007)	Authorized officer DEBORAH A. THOMAS John Cottingham PARALEGAL SPECIALIST Telephone No. (571) 272-7079
--	--	---

Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (April 2005)

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US04/25931

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of
- ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
 - ☐ a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
- a. type of material
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 - ☐ on paper
 - ☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/US04/25931

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>13 and 14</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-40</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-40</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-40</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Please See Continuation Sheet

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US04/25931

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

V. 2. Citations and Explanations:

(1). Claims 1-12 and 15-40 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Stark (Patent No. 5,935,210 filed November 27, 1996).

(2). Regarding Claim 1, 30, and 39, Stark teaches mapping the structure of a collection of computer resources.

The method and associated system for mapping the structure of a collection of computer resources as taught or suggested by Stark includes:

displaying a property tree (col. 5, lines 1-5, 'The resource map 300 presents the site 40 as a tree having as its root node 302...', the property tree having a plurality of nodes (col. 5, lines 1-5, 'The resource map 300 presents the site 40 as a tree having as its root node 302 the information characterizing the home page 42 ("root resource")', col. 5, lines 9-24, 'The resource map 300 also includes several branch nodes 304-316 extending from and hierarchically subordinate to the root node 302.') exposing properties of a set of data items (col. 5, lines 9-47, 'The resource map 300 includes one main route branch 304, 306, 308, 310 for the links 54, 56, 58, 66 to HTML page 44, image file 50, audio file 52...'); in response to user input (figure 11, element 527) indicative of an assignment of at least one property exposed by the property tree (col. 5, lines 34-47, '...expansion box 324, which allows the user to expand or collapse the node...', col. 6, lines 38-44, 'The map manager module 108 also allows the user to change resource maps (e.g., change the text displayed in a node of a map) and to search maps for particular information...'; col. 9, line 9, col. 10, line 1, '...invention by operating on input data...'); modifying the value (figure 6A, element 214, figure 6B, elements 220, 225, 226, 230, and 232) associated with at least one property (e.g., change the text displayed in a node of a map) and to search maps for particular information...'; col. 9, line 9, col. 10, line 1, '...invention by operating on input data...') in the data storage system (col. 4, lines 25-30).

(3). Regarding Claim 2, Stark teaches the user input is indicative of adding metadata (figure 6A, element 214 'Add meta-data to root resource object') to at least one property node in the property tree (e.g., change the text displayed in a node of a map) and to search maps for particular information...'; col. 9, line 9, col. 10, line 1, '...invention by operating on input data...').

(4). Regarding Claim 3, Stark teaches the user input is indicative of removing metadata from at least one property node in the property tree (col. 5, lines 34-47, 'When the node is expanded, the expansion box 324 display a "minus" sign, indicating that the node will collapse if the user selects the expansion box 324.').

(5). Regarding Claims 4 and 22, Stark teaches displaying the property tree in a pane in a window (col. 4, lines 59 and 60, 'HTML page 44 likewise includes a link 60 to HTML page 46...'), the window having a second pane displaying a list view of data items (col. 4, lines 59 and 60, 'HTML page 44 likewise includes a link 60 to HTML page 46...').

(6). Regarding Claim 5, Stark teaches the user input includes expanding at least one property node (col. 5, lines 34-47, '...the expansion box displays a "plus" sign, indicating that the node will expand if the box 324 is selected').

NOTES TO FORM PCT/ISA/220 (continued)

The letter must indicate the differences between the claims as filed and the claims as amended. It must, in particular, indicate, in connection with each claim appearing in the international application (it being understood that identical indications concerning several claims may be grouped), whether

- (i) the claim is unchanged;
- (ii) the claim is cancelled;
- (iii) the claim is new;
- (iv) the claim replaces one or more claims as filed;
- (v) the claim is the result of the division of a claim as filed.

The following examples illustrate the manner in which amendments must be explained in the accompanying letter:

1. [Where originally there were 48 claims and after amendment of some claims there are 51]:
"Claims 1 to 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37 to 48 replaced by amended claims bearing the same numbers;
claims 30, 33 and 36 unchanged; new claims 49 to 51 added."
2. [Where originally there were 15 claims and after amendment of all claims there are 11]:
"Claims 1 to 15 replaced by amended claims 1 to 11."
3. [Where originally there were 14 claims and the amendments consist in cancelling some claims and in adding new claims]:
"Claims 1 to 6 and 14 unchanged; claims 7 to 13 cancelled; new claims 15, 16 and 17 added." or
"Claims 7 to 13 cancelled; new claims 15, 16 and 17 added; all other claims unchanged."
4. [Where various kinds of amendments are made]:
"Claims 1-10 unchanged; claims 11 to 13, 18 and 19 cancelled; claims 14, 15 and 16 replaced by amended claim 14; claim 17 subdivided into amended claims 15, 16 and 17; new claims 20 and 21 added."

"Statement under Article 19(1)" (Rule 46.4).

The amendments may be accompanied by a statement explaining the amendments and indicating any impact that such amendments might have on the description and the drawings (which cannot be amended under Article 19(1)). The statement will be published with the international application and the amended claims.

It must be in the language in which the international application is to be published.

It must be brief, not exceeding 500 words if in English or if translated into English.

It should not be confused with and does not replace the letter indicating the differences between the claims as filed and as amended. It must be filed on a separate sheet and must be identified as such by a heading, preferably by using the words "Statement under Article 19(1)."

It may not contain any disparaging comments on the international search report or the relevance of citations contained in that report. Reference to citations, relevant to a given claim, contained in the international search report may be made only in connection with an amendment of that claim.

Consequence if a demand for international preliminary examination has already been filed

If, at the time of filing any amendments and any accompanying statement, under Article 19, a demand for international preliminary examination has already been submitted, the applicant must preferably, at the time of filing the amendments (and any statement) with the International Bureau, also file with the International Preliminary Examining Authority a copy of such amendments (and of any statement) and, where required, a translation of such amendments for the procedure before that Authority (see Rules 55.3(a) and 62.2, first sentence). For further information, see the Notes to the demand form (PCT/ISA/401).

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, the written opinion of the International Searching Authority will, except in certain cases where the International Preliminary Examining Authority did not act as International Searching Authority and where it has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b), be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority. If a demand is made, the applicant may submit to the International Preliminary Examining Authority a reply to the written opinion together, where appropriate, with amendments before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later (Rule 43bis.1(c)).

Consequence with regard to translation of the international application ^{upon} entry into the national phase

The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that, upon entry into the national phase, a translation of the claims as amended under Article 19 may have to be furnished to the designated/elected Offices, instead of, or in addition to, the translation of the claims as filed.

For further details on the requirements of each designated/elected Office, see the *PCT Applicant's Guide*, Volume II.